

Attachment 1

Draft Meeting Notes Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force

MEETING DATE: December 14, 2016

MEETING LOCATION: CMAP Offices

CALLED TO ORDER: 1:00 p.m.

ATTENDANCE:

TASK FORCE MEMBERS OR ALTERNATES:

Tom Rickert, Kane Co. DOT, Chairman
Keith Privett, CDOT, Co-Chair
Bruce Christensen, LDOT (on phone)
Ron Burke, Active Transportation Alliance
Jessica Ortega, DuPage Co. Forest Preserve
Ed Barsotti, Ride Illinois
Sidney Kenyon, DuPage DOT
Marla Kindred (on phone)
Jason Meter, CTA
Patrick Knapp, KKCOM
Kevin Staniel, RTA
Steve Mannella, Metra
Allan Mellis, Citizen

ABSENT:

Randy Neufeld, SRAM Corp
Katie Knapp, City of Evanston
Richard Bascomb, Village of Schaumburg
Greg Piland, FHWA
Karen Shinnars, Pace
Pamela Sielski, Cook County Forest Preserve District
Gin Kilgore, Bike Winter / LIB
Dave Longo, IDNR
Representative, CNT

CMAP STAFF:

John O'Neal
Jane Grover
Lindsay Bayley
Doug Ferguson
Aaron Brown

OTHERS:

Cori Crawford, Will Co. Forest Preserve District
Lee Crandell, Lakeview Chamber of Commerce
Vanessa Irizarry, CDOT
Marty Mueller, Knight E/A Inc.
Amruta Mate, IDOT (ADA Coordinator)
Tom Kelso, IDOT
Nan Newlon, Downers Grove
Tim Gustafson, Alta Planning + Design
Luis Uresti, IDOT OP&P / UIC
Dave Landeweer, Terra Engineering
Brian Hacker, RTA
Brain Pigeon, NWMC / North Shore Council of Mayors
Allison Buchwach, Metra
Tim O'Brian, Village of Niles
Tomohiko Music, CCDOTH
Hanna Kite, Active Transportation Alliance
Nan Newlon, Downers Grove (on phone)
Marla Kindred, IDOT (on phone)
Amruta Mate, IDOT (on phone)

1.0 Introductions

Members and attendees introduced themselves. The Chair invited Sidney Kenyon, from DuPage DOT who requested to join the Task Force as representing counties (replacing Daniel Thomas).

2.0 Approval of the Minutes

No corrections to the minutes were proposed. *Motion was then made and seconded for approval of the meeting notes. The motion was unanimously approved.*

3.0 Local and Regional Planning

3.1 CMAP ON TO 2050 Outreach

Jane Grover, CMAP Outreach Principal, reviewed ongoing public outreach and engagement activities undertaken for the development of the ON TO 2050 comprehensive regional plan. Ms. Grover highlighted themes related to multimodal transportation and walked Task Force members and attendees through an interactive presentation on ON TO 2050 outreach, demonstrating the use of key-pad polling.

Ms. Grover introduced ON TO 2050 and the component of outreach, stressing the need for a new, updated regional comprehensive plan to reflect changes in demographics, travel behaviors, environmental impacts from global warming, land uses, technologies, economics and economic development, etc. She then led the Task Force through a key-pad polling exercise, with

questions on travel and transportation – habits, challenges the region faces, potential priorities and opportunities.

She then outlined the timeline for plan development and adoption, as well as future opportunities for participation.

Mr. Mellis asked if ON TO 2050 would build on GO TO 2040, and if it would not only recommend that investment in transit should be a priority, but also reflect that in proposed major capital projects and in funding programs.

3.2 Non-Motorized Transportation Snapshot Report

Lindsay Bayley, project manager for the development of a Non-Motorized Transportation Snapshot Report, presented on this effort, which is currently underway. Ms. Bayley informed the Task Force that the report is being developed as one in a series of ‘snapshots’ on regional trends and current conditions, and that it will help define additional research needs and opportunities for ON TO 2050. The Non-Motorized Snapshot will compare conditions and practices in our region for bicycling and walking and highlight changes between (roughly) 2010 and now. Ms. Bayley stated that the topic of the report responds to regional interests as expressed in public forums and outreach activities related to ON TO 2050.

Ms. Bayley described the two (anticipated) phases for report development and the general timeline. She highlighted the key research questions related to bicycling and bicycle facilities, walking and pedestrian facilities, and ped-bike safety and issues of equity, and economic development. She then highlighted some of the preliminary research and findings.

Ms. Bayley described data (limitations) for understanding basic information (levels, routes, etc.) about bicycling and walking in the region, and stated that these limitations will likely result in a relatively qualitative – as opposed to quantitative – snapshot report.

Task Force members discussed the importance of ‘multimodality’ in relation to bicycling and walking. Mr. Mellis suggested that bicycle parking apps may be on the horizon, and that inter-agency collaboration has increased over the last several years – examples being the Cal-Sag and Skokie Valley Trails – as has interdepartmental collaboration in big cities like Chicago – e.g. for a project like the 606 Trail. He stated that he believed that the ‘culture’ has changed over the past 10 years or so from agencies and decision-makers asking, “Why should we create bike lanes?” to “How can we create bike lanes?” He added that the “Complete Streets” movement emerged, and gained recognition and traction during the last several years. Mr. Knapp stated that he thought that an awareness of the economic development potential of bicycle and pedestrian improvements emerged and grew over the last 10 years or so. Mr. Mellis added that this fact has also raised gentrification issues. Mr. Kenyon stated that awareness of ADA Transition Plans has grown.

Other innovations or changes that Task Force members mentioned include: prioritization of pedestrians; pedestrian countdown signals; LPIs; Divvy Bike Share, and the Divvy-for-All program; enabling technologies related to smart phones, as well as challenges they bring, such as distracted driving and walking.

When asked about communities that have made progress in bicycle and pedestrian accommodation, especially in terms of its connection to broader goals like economic development, Task Force members mentioned Winfield, Batavia and other Fox River towns, the City of Chicago (and specific neighborhoods like Pullman), Evanston, Aurora, Naperville, Mundelein, La Grange, among others.

3.3 Will County Bikeway Plan

Cori Crawford, of the Forest Preserve District of Will County, presented on the Will County Bikeway Plan, which was completed and adopted this year. The plan was prepared under the guidance of the FPDWC as the lead agency, with support from the Will County Division of Transportation. Ms. Crawford explained the origin and the development of the plan, described its contents, and discussed the anticipated role of the plan in the promotion of cycling and bikeways in Will County.

Ms. Crawford stressed the collaborative nature of the plan, highlighting the connection between the Will Connects 2040 LRTP and the Bikeway Plan. She described the steering committee and its work to develop the plan framework (vision and goals) and to define bikeway corridors, and to come up with prioritized recommendations. She reviewed the extensive public outreach process undertaken for plan development and what the substance of the input received and how it helped to shape the plan and plan recommendations. She described the process utilized to select bikeway corridors, including key criteria relating to usefulness, ease of travel, safety/comfort level, recreational value, and feasibility. Ms. Crawford then showed maps highlighting county-wide bikeway corridors, as well as the overall scores, which lead to five corridors being selected for further study. Ms. Crawford discussed next steps, including County Board adoption, adoption by local agencies and collaboration on implementation.

Mr. Mellis asked if the FPD worked with the County Zoning Department, which he said was useful to the Cook Co. FPD in developing projects. Ms. Crawford stated they they did so, mostly in identifying locations where bridges / overpasses might be needed. Mr. Burke congratulated the County and FPD on the completion of this plan and asked if buy-in from local agencies was relatively easy to obtain, stressing that various jurisdictions would be responsible for realizing the plan. Mr. Barsotti, who was part of the planning effort, said that coordination with locale agencies is a strategy the plan recognizes and supports and that it is anticipated that cities would be reporting to the County on progress.

4.0 Pedestrian and Bicycle Project Programming

4.1 Lincoln Hub (Lakeview Chamber of Commerce, City of Chicago)

Lee Crandell, Executive Director of the Lakeview Chamber of Commerce, together with Vanessa Irizarry of CDOT, presented on the “Lincoln Hub,” an intersection and place-making project at the intersection of Lincoln, Wellington, and Southport Avenues in the City of Chicago. The project’s overarching goal was to provide safer, more comfortable, more inviting space for pedestrians to traverse and linger. The project combined traffic calming, pedestrian improvements, and public art to create a memorable focal point along an important commercial and entertainment corridor in the Lakeview neighborhood.

Ms. Irizarry explained that the project was part of the “Make Way for People” (MWFP) program, which includes “People Spots,” “People Streets,” “People Alleys,” and “People

Plazas.” She touched on other examples from around the City of MWFP projects. Mr. Crandell introduced and described the Lakeview Chamber of Commerce, SSA 27, and their mission:

To support a vibrant local economy and high quality of life for the benefit of Lakeview businesses and residents by improving and enhancing public streets and spaces, creating memorable experiences, encouraging spending locally and promoting the neighborhood. He described the Lakeview Area Master Plan and the process, including extensive public outreach, to develop that plan and the vision it advances. Mr. Crandell then describe the goals of the “Lincoln Hub” project and its scope of work. He emphasized that it grew out of and drew upon precedents from around the country for traffic calming and place-making projects. He then described the implementation process (city approvals, RFP, vendor selection, and construction), emphasizing initial difficulties in locating companies that could construct such an unusual project. He finished with photos of the finished project and the generally favorable reviews/opinions of both residents and nearby businesses.

Mr. Mellis asked about the cost, which Mr. Crandell said was approximately \$175k for the whole four blocks of the larger project of which the “Lincoln Hub” intersection was a (major) part. He added that he thought the Hub itself cost about \$90K. Mr. Mellis then asked how people felt about it and if the Chamber would be doing “before-after” analysis, surveys, etc. Mr. Crandell said that, yes, the Chamber and SSA were doing informal surveys and that impressions were, for the most part, very favorable. He added that there were small tweaks that had to be made in the size/shape of the curb-extensions and the placement of bollards. Mr. Mellis asked if there were other locations where such projects were being planned. Ms. Irizarry said that, yes, the City was actively seeking input from neighborhood and civic groups for future MWFP projects of various types.

4.2 CMAQ Project Evaluation – Bicycle Level of Stress Analysis

Aaron Brown and Doug Ferguson, of CMAP, presented on refinements to and expected utilization of the Bike Switching Model / Bicycle Level of Stress analysis, which was first discussed at the March Task Force meeting. Mr. Brown, responding to input from Task Force members, was asked to investigate a Bicycle Level of Stress (BLS) approach as a way to better understand the potential for proposed CMAQ projects to bring about mode shift (private motor vehicle to bicycle). Mr. Brown researched and developed a Level of Stress metric to be used in place of the Bicycle Level of Service metric in the Bicycle Switching Model. Mr. Brown and Mr. Ferguson presented on this research and potential tool, and its application in CMAQ programming.

Mr. Ferguson introduced the presentation by giving a brief overview of the CMAQ programming process and the potential role of the Bike Switching Model / Bicycle Level of Stress analysis in this larger process.

Mr. Brown then gave an overview of the model, which is designed to identify trips that may be affected by the facility improvement, determine the difference in travel “costs” due to a proposed improvement, and estimate the probability of an auto trip switching to bicycle mode. He explained that the LTS analysis consisted of three components: segments, intersection approaches, and crossing (signalized vs. unsignalized). He concluded that both LTS and BLOS suffer from insufficient data, inability to factor user (bicyclist) tolerance, no way to include latent demand, obscure “formula” for calculation with no way to empirically validate, and inability to

fully account for newer/enhanced on-street bikeway facility types. He emphasized that the tool is not able to “route” or assign bicycle trips to the network (i.e. it cannot answer the question: “How many people will use this facility?”) and that it is intended as a programming and not really a planning tool. With those caveats, Mr. Brown stated that, when comparing the total length for all trips modeled, the BLS resulted in slightly shorter trips. For one sample project, the (generally) shorter trip length was again evident. These results were mainly the product of routing trips along (lower stress) streets as opposed to (out of the way) off-street trails/paths.

Mr. Barsotti stated that he thought that both the LTS and BLOS methods were weak or more inaccurate when it came to distinguishing between “bad” or “uncomfortable/stressful” roads/routes. Both approaches simply are not subtle enough at this end of the spectrum of roads – mostly due to lack of detailed data about roadway and traffic conditions and characteristics – for segments, for intersections, and for the ‘transitions’ between these – as well as about bicyclist needs in relation to destinations, routes, etc.

5.0 Project Updates

Ms. Kindred noticed that the former IDOT rep, Aren Kriks, was still on the agenda (Task Force members list) and asked that it be removed and replaced with her name.

6.0 Public Comment, Announcements, and Other Business

No comments.

7.0 2014 Meeting Dates

Proposed 2017 meeting dates were presented to be discussed/approved at the next (March) Task Force meeting:

- Wednesday, March 15, 2017 at 1:00 p.m
- Wednesday, June 14, 2017 at 1:00 p.m
- Wednesday, September 13, 2017 at 1:00 p.m
- Wednesday, December 13, 2017 at 1:00 p.m

7.0 Adjournment: 3:00 PM